



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of bodies on one another in order to make the resultant new body truly organic or living. This action is so deeply reciprocal that (quoting) "while producing determinative change in [each of] the bodies, at the same time [it] leaves the individuality of these not only identifiable and unimpaired, but even improved relative to their former states." The sentence from which this is quoted begins "It is that relational action in living bodies which, while producing" *etc.* (as above).

It now seems to me that instead of conceiving this "relational action" as operating "*in living bodies*," as though it were merely an incident to such bodies, we must conceive it to be of the very deepest nature of these bodies. Except for this peculiar reciprocal action apparently no body could possess any of the attributes of life.

I wish now to invite attention to another injurious effect almost sure to result from a general use of integration as the linguistic mate of differentiation. Since integration has long been generally accepted as the antithetic mate of disintegration, the common utilization of it in the terminology of human affairs would almost inevitably tend to set it in opposition to differentiation in the sense of inhibiting it. Or, otherwise stated, since all differentiation involves change, the tendency would be to make the principle of integration act as an inhibitor of any change. With the conservative type of mind, the idea of integration could easily become a new and powerful brake upon the wheels of human progress, since it would be the most natural thing in the world for such minds to believe any change whatever that did not chance to be to their personal liking, to portend disintegration rather than progress.

WILLIAM E. RITTER.

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA.

BOOK REVIEWS

Russian Dissenters. FREDERICK C. CONYBEARE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1921. Pp. 370.

Perhaps no group of Christian believers are more deserving of study for their psychology and their rites than are the Russian dissenters. Few indeed are the religions of Western Europe or America that are as picturesque or as removed from the common thought of the world. Yet it may be added that few considerable numbers of Christians have ever received less attention at home or abroad. Hitherto in English the chief source has been the descriptive account of them in M. Leroy-Beaulieu's *Empire of the Tsars and Russians*, and for this reason we welcome the closely historical treatment of Professor Conybeare.

Although the author modestly states that his work is a compilation, yet we can not help feeling that his knowledge of Bogomilism and the allied cults has enabled him to present admirably the striking similarities between these and the Russian sectarians. It is the more remarkable, therefore, that the book does not discuss the possible direct contacts between Russia and the Bogomils in the early centuries and the first organized antiecclesiastical organization of Russia, the sect of the Strigolniki which appeared in Pskov in the fourteenth century. Similarly we miss any description of the Judaizers, who were able to place on the metropolitan see of Holy Russia in 1493 a man who was almost a convert to the Jewish faith. We should also like to know the opinion of Professor Conybeare on the Armenian Martin whom later stories (probably apocryphal) regarded as the originator of the rites of the Old Believers.

Unfortunately the righteous indignation of the author at the stupid and tyrannical government of the Tsar has led him to be unjust to the Orthodox Church. He rightly emphasizes the dislike and the dismay with which the peasants greeted the centralizing policy of Moscow. He does not emphasize the cause of that policy. To him the Tartar invasion means that a savage people had wiped from the earth a peaceful and developing native civilization (p. 26). This has been a popular idea since the World War and the Russian Revolution. Centuries of bloody Civil War in Russia which culminated in the sack of Kiev in 1169 and the accounts of the old Russian slave trade luridly deny that the source of all evil lay in the autocracy. It may well be argued that it was only the policy of autocracy, bribery and servility inaugurated by Moscow with the blessing of the Church that succeeded in unifying Russia and saving Moscow from that permanent foreign control which ruined Kievan Russia for centuries. The Troublous Times and the occupation of the Kremlin by Poland in 1610 again brought Russia to the verge of ruin and rendered necessary the changes of the century, although the unhappy country did not have the trained leaders to undertake the work.

In the rough manner of his time Nikon endeavored to carry out needed reforms. If we read the virulent denunciation of the Patriarch on p. 19 and the criticism of his reforms on p. 42, we notice a contrast. Nikon fought to free the clergy from a humiliating position as the slave of the mir. He fought against a narrow nationalism which hated the Latins, loathed the Kievan monks and despised the Greeks. Avvakum and his followers were far less concerned that Nikon used a poor Greek manuscript than that he used a Greek manuscript at all. One of the chief problems was the decrees of the

Stoglav Council. This supported the contention of the nationalists, but is it "monstrously critical" for the Orthodox to doubt the validity of decrees passed in 1551 and invoked for the first time in 1642? The innovations of the Old Believers probably arose in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It is hard to see how they could have originated during the period when all the higher ecclesiastics were themselves Greek, and the Church was absolutely an exotic growth (p. 3).

The same unwillingness to recognize anything but might as on the side of the Orthodox is a sad blemish on the entire work. The "jaundiced narrative" of Ivanovski (p. 115) denies the moral excellences of the thief and forger Bishop Epiphanius. The four bishops who succeeded him were so obviously of an unsatisfactory character that the author forbears to mention them.

The author has gone too far in his endeavor to deny or defend suicide by fire. The teachings of Avvakum (quoted in Anderson, *Raskol and the Sects*, p. 130) recommend it. The stikh of the Woman Alleluia ascribed this teaching to Christ himself (Porfiev, *History of Russian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 355). Finally M. Leroy-Beaulieu cites a number of modern instances (*op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 320). It would be interesting to explain the purpose of Ivanov in starting one holocaust after another (p. 154). It is more reasonable to assume that he was seeking to make martyrs of his disciples or dupes.

The chapter on marriage is very full but again the author's enthusiasm for the sectarians leads him to veil in many words what may seem to be an unpleasant condition. The key to the entire question is to be found on p. 193. "The 'marriageless' sectary may not approve of unions concluded for the whole of life, but find it a burden. He aspires to another type of conjugal relationship, a type which more nearly approximates to the ancient Slavonic free union, dissoluble by the will of either party. He has scanty regard for the Byzantine type of family which has only gained currency in Russia during the last few centuries." Nestor and the early chroniclers declared that the early pagan Slavs practised free love and had no conception of family life. The Orthodox sacrament of matrimony and the life-long monogamy seem to have been inseparably connected in the minds of the Russians and the loss of one necessarily destroyed the other. Certain of the sectarians were able to develop the old-fashioned Protestant conception of marriage and were able to bring order into their life. Others endeavored to satisfy their consciences in various ways and we learn that many of the Raskol were living in relationships which even their own code would not approve (p. 209). These relationships were tolerated and we need only mention the

demoralizing influence of such manners. What part does this play in the rumors of various marriage innovations since the Russian Revolution?

Turning to the second part of the work, we note with regret that Professor Conybeare did not make use of the recent work of Bonch-Bruyevich, *Materials for the History and Study of the Russian Sects and Raskol*. In this there is published a large collection of the songs of the Dukhobortsy. We may add that many of the scholars of Russian religion, such as Vladimir Anderson, group the Dukhobortsy together with the Khlysty, and many of their documents, edited by Bonch-Bruyevich, testify to their belief in this similarity. They are certainly more closely related than are the Dukhobortsy and the Stundists. Finally Professor Conybeare does not mention the spiritual dynasty of the Dukhobortsy, one of their chief characteristics. Aylmer Maude in his work, *A Peculiar People*, describes in detail the *via dolorosa* leading to the emigration to Canada. He also reveals his disgust at the trickery of Tchertkoff and the leaders of the Dukhobortsy toward those who were helping the poor Russians. This omission relieves the author of mentioning the naked pilgrimages and other events¹ which present the "true soul of the Russian peasant" in a less favorable light.

The account of the Mystical Sects could also be improved by the use of the work of Bonch-Bruyevich. Their denial of the unique deity of Christ gains for them a certain amount of approval, though we should like to hear more of the succession of Christs among them. Professor Conybeare mildly remarks that some of their Christs may impose upon their followers (p. 343), but he really disapproves of no sectarian save the "obscene fanatic" Selivanov. This man was once a member of the Khlysty or "People of God" as they prefer to be called, and the violence of the Skoptsy can easily be interpreted as a reaction from unrestrained license in the parent sect. In this connection we may mention the career of Shchetinin. This man (the subject of a long study by Bonch-Bruyevich) founded the sect of the Chemreki, which was an acknowledged branch of the Khlyst movement. He openly preached religious immorality and maintained his position for some years. There have been many similar teachers, notably the famous Rasputin, who operated in Russian court circles. Apologists for the sectarians have usually denied that these men represented any element of the Khlysty, but in such a case they should group them as representative of a certain tendency perhaps connected with the Slavonic free union.

¹ The most recent of these was a threat by the God-man, Peter Verigin, to kill all the children of the community as a protest against the Canadian government. (*New York Times*, February 21, 1922.)

The author again has not sufficiently emphasized the importance which mystic anarchy has had on the entire movement. Most of the sects which have been opposed to the government of the Tsar were opposed not because it was autocratic, but because it was a government. The refusal of military service, the refusal of the oath of allegiance, the refusal to pay taxes, all recur with monotonous regularity in the accounts of these sects. The World War brought them to the attention of this Government (see the article of Dean Stone in the *Columbia University Quarterly*, Vol. XXI, p. 263). Their opposition to secular government does not render them opposed to autocratic rule by their Christ-ruler, and in the course of time it will probably be seen that these sects are less of a trouble in an autocracy than in any form of democracy.

We may well compare the Russian sectarian movements to a sea with certain main currents. On the surface of these currents are various waves which rise and fall in constant changing struggle. These waves are the individual sects. None of them has ever formulated any definite code; none of them, save the Austrian Hierarchy of the Popovtsy, has maintained a clear and distinct history similar to that of the leading Protestant sects of Western Europe. Most of them form sympathetic but disorganized groups with no external discipline and any movement is liable in different places to produce all types of leaders, from the pious efficiency of Denisov to the savagery of Selivanov. For this reason it is as impossible to approve their principles as a movement as it is to condemn their excesses as a sign of general decadence.

In conclusion we may say that the book would have been far more valuable had the author not been so animated with the belief that it is "the heretics and dissenters [of both hemispheres] who will point the way [to unity] and by their example shame formalists into true charity" (p. 258). He has brought together a great mass of valuable material, but his constant tendency to champion the cause of the dissenter and to omit or deny any aspects which do not prejudice us in his favor weakens the book. The reader should most certainly supplement this work with that of M. Leroy-Beaulieu, who has described the defects of the Orthodox Church of Russia no less severely, but has endeavored at the same time to write impartially of the different sectarian movements and to evaluate their real significance for Russia and civilization.

CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.